



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,038	08/29/2006	Michael Bahr	4001-1226	5833
466	7590	04/08/2009	EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON			EDWARDS JR, TIMOTHY	
209 Madison Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 500			2612	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			MAIL DATE	
			04/08/2009	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/591,038	Applicant(s) BAHR ET AL.
	Examiner Timothy Edwards, Jr.	Art Unit 2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-8, 10, 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zeitzew US 2003/0142587.

Considering claim 1, Zeitzew discloses a sensor node having, **a**) means for measuring a sensor measurement value (see paragraph 0026); **b**) means for measuring distance (see paragraph 0006); **c**) means for communication (see fig 1B, item 129).

Considering claim 2, Zeitzew discloses the limitation of this claim (see paragraph 0063).

Considering claims 3, 13 Zeitzew discloses the limitation of these claims (see paragraph 0070).

Considering claims 4, 14, 16 Zeitzew discloses the limitation of these claims (see paragraph 0032).

Considering claims 5, 15, 17, 18 Zeitzew discloses the limitation of these claims (see paragraph 0072).

Considering claims 6, 12 Zeitzew discloses the limitation of these claims (see fig 1B item 124).

Considering claim 7, Zeitzew discloses the limitation of this claim (see paragraph 0041).

Considering claim 8, 19 Zeitzew discloses the limitation of this claim (see paragraph 0070).

Considering claim 10, Zeitzew discloses the limitation of this claim (see paragraph 0097).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9, 11, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zeitzew as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Mandhyan et al US 2004/0028023.

Considering claim 9, Zeitzew does not specifically recite the sensor network can communicate with remote sensor nodes by forwarding the communication via adjacent sensor nodes. Zeitzew teaches sending sensor data from a plurality of sensors to a remote location (see paragraph 0098). Mandhyan teaches sending bidirectional data to/from sensors deposited over a large area via an adjacent sensor (see paragraph 0021). One of ordinary skill in the art readily recognizes sensors furthest from the control station over a large distance would require a higher transmission power to transmit its data to the control station, thereby draining the power source more rapidly. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a data forwarding method as taught by Mandhyan in the sensor system of Zeitzew because both systems are concerned with obtaining data from a plurality of sensor units.

Considering claim 11, Zeitzew does not specifically recite the sensor network is a self-organizing sensor network. Mandhyan teaches this limitation (see paragraph 0008). Mandhyan teaches a self-organizing sensor network does not require the intervention of human to establish communication if the sensors are dynamically moving (see paragraph 0021). One of ordinary skill in the art readily recognizes the advantages in a system as taught by Mandhyan. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to use of the sensor organizing method of Mandhyan in the Zeitzew system because both systems are concern with establishing a sensor network.

Considering claim 20, the limitation of this claim is interpreted and rejected as stated in claim 9.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

If the claimed invention is amended, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification, which dictate(s) the structure/description relied upon to assist the Examiner in proper interpretation of the amended language and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Timothy Edwards, Jr. at telephone number (571) 272-3067. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m. The examiner cannot be reached on Fridays.

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Zimmerman, can be reached at (571) 272-3059.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-4700, Mon-Fri., 8:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m.

Any response to this action should be fax to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for entry).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov> or contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Timothy Edwards, Jr./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2612
April 7, 2009